

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed April 11, 2008 ("Office Action"). Claims 1-31 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-21, 23-28, 30 and 31 currently stand rejected. Claims 4, 10, 22, and 29 are objected to. Applicant amends Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 15, 17, 18, 27, and 31 and cancels Claims 4, 10, and 22, without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicant adds new Claims 32 and 33, which are fully supported by the originally-filed specification. Applicant's amendments, cancellations, and additions have been made to advance prosecution of this Application and not to overcome the cited references.

Summary of Examiner Interview

Applicant's attorney, Ms. Christa Brown-Sanford (Reg. No. 58,503), conducted a telephone interview with Examiner Daniel Ryman on June 11, 2008. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courtesy and opportunity to conduct the telephone interview. Applicant submits this summary of the telephone interview to record the Applicant's understanding of the substance of the interview and to comply with M.P.E.P. § 713.04.

During the interview, the Examiner and the Applicant's attorney discussed the rejections of Claims 5, 15, 17, and 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Applicant suggested claim amendments to advance prosecution of this case.

Claim Objections

The Examiner objected to Claims 1, 2, and 5 and provided suggested amendments. *Office Action*, p. 8. Applicant amends Claims 1, 2, and 5 to correct the typographical errors and respectfully requests that the claim objections be withdrawn.

Section 112 Rejections

Claims 5, 15, 17, and 27, were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. *Office Action*, p. 9. While Applicant does not necessarily acquiesce to the Examiner's rejections, Applicant amends Claim 5, 15, 17, and 27 to address the Examiner's concerns and to advance prosecution of the Application. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of these rejections.

Section 102 Rejections

Claims 6, 12, 18, 23, 24, 30, and 31 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,006,452 to Lund (“*Lund*”). “A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); M.P.E.P § 2131.

To advance prosecution of this application, Applicant incorporates the limitations of objected to Claim 10 into independent Claim 6, the limitations of objected to Claim 22 into independent Claim 18, and the limitations of objected to Claim 10 into Claim 31. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 6, 18, and 31 along with their dependent claims.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1, 2, 7-9, 16, 19-21, and 28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lund* in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lund* in view of Applicant’s Admitted Prior Art as applied to Claim 1 above, and further in view of U. S. Patent No. 7,035,249 to Christensen et al. (“*Christensen*”). Claims 11, 13, 14, 25, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Lund* as applied to Claims 6 and 18 above, and further in view of *Christensen*. “To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.” M.P.E.P. §2143.03 (emphasis added). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

To advance prosecution of this application, Applicant incorporates the limitations of objected to Claim 4 into independent Claim 1. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of independent Claims 1 along with its dependent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7-9 and 16. Because Claims 7-9 and 16 incorporate the limitations of their independent Claim 6, which Applicant has shown to be allowable, Claims 7-9 and 16 are allowable for at least this reason. Furthermore, Claims 7-9 and 16 recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 7-9 and 16.

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 19-21 and 28. Because Claims 19-21 and 28 incorporate the limitations of their independent Claim 18, which Applicant has shown to be allowable, Claims 19-21 and 28 are allowable for at least this reason. Furthermore, Claims 19-21 and 28 recite additional limitations that are not disclosed, taught, or suggested in the cited references. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of Claims 19-21 and 28.

Allowable Claims

Applicant notes with appreciation the Examiner's indication that Claims 4, 10, 17, 22, and 29 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. *Office Action*, pp. 20-21. As discussed above, Applicant incorporates the limitations of objected to Claim 4 into Claim 1 and cancels Claim 4. Applicant incorporates the limitation of Claim 10 into independent Claim 6 and cancels Claim 10. Applicant incorporates the limitations of Claim 22 into Claim 18 and cancels Claim 22. Applicant rewrites objected to Claims 17 and 29 as new independent Claims 32 and 33, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims.

New Claims

Applicant adds new Claims 32 and 33, which are fully supported by the specification of the present Application as originally filed. Claim 32 is objected to Claim 17 written in independent form. Claim 33 is objected to Claim 29 written in independent form. Therefore, Claims 32 and 33 are allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests consideration and allowance of Claims 32 and 33.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for allowance. For the foregoing reasons, and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of all pending claims.

If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would advance prosecution of this Application in any manner, the Examiner is invited to contact Christa Brown-Sanford, Attorney for Applicant, at the Examiner's convenience at (214) 953-6824.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge \$810.00 for this RCE and \$420.00 for additional independent claims to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P. Although no other fees are believed due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 02-0384 of Baker Botts L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,

BAKER BOTT S L.L.P.

Attorneys for Applicant



Christa Brown-Sanford

Reg. No. 58,503

Date: June 12, 2008

Correspondence Address:

at Customer No. **05073**